```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
                        NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 2
                              LUBBOCK DIVISION
 3
      UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
               Government,
 4
     VS.
                                         CAUSE NO. 5:23-CR-005-H
 5
      FREDERICK FRANCIS GOLTZ,
                Defendant.
 6
 7
 8
 9
                             SENTENCING HEARING
                 BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES WESLEY HENDRIX
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10
                               AUGUST 3, 2023
11
                               LUBBOCK, TEXAS
12
13
14
                           A P P E A R A N C E S
15
      FOR THE GOVERNMENT:
      UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
      1205 TEXAS AVENUE, SUITE 700
16
     LUBBOCK, TEXAS 79401
     BY: JEFFREY R. HAAG
17
18
     FOR THE DEFENDANT:
19
     KING LAW
     ATTORNEYS AT LAW
20
     814 MAIN STREET, SUITE B
     LUBBOCK, TEXAS 79401
     BY: MICHAEL L. KING
21
22
23
     FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: MECHELLE DANIEL, 1205 TEXAS
      AVENUE, LUBBOCK, TEXAS 79401, (806) 744-7667.
24
      PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY; TRANSCRIPT
     PRODUCED BY COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION.
25
```

1	INDEX	
2		
3	DEFENDANT'S OBJECTIONS TO PRESENTENCE REPORT	4
4	DEFENDANT'S SENTENCING EVIDENCE/ARGUMENT	20
5	STATEMENT BY EMILEE GOLTZ	24
6	STATEMENT BY SCOTT LEECH	27
7	STATEMENT BY LAURA GOLTZ	30
8	ALLOCUTION	35
9	STATEMENT BY THOMAS LIDDY	41
10	GOVERNMENT'S SENTENCING EVIDENCE/ARGUMENT	50
11	SENTENCING FACTORS	58
12	SENTENCE BY THE COURT	65
13	RIGHT TO APPEAL	68
14	OBJECTION TO SENTENCE	69
15	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	70
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21	* * * *	
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
1
                           PROCEEDINGS
 2
                 THE COURT: The Court calls the next case of the
 3
     morning, United States vs. Frederick Francis Goltz,
 4
     5:23-CR-005-1.
                 Who is here on behalf of the defendant?
 5
                 MR. KING: Good morning, Your Honor. Michael King
 6
 7
     appearing with Mr. Goltz. We're present and ready.
                 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. King.
 8
 9
                 For the United States?
10
                 MR. HAAG: Jeffrey Haag on behalf of the
11
     United States. Ready to proceed, Your Honor.
12
                 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Haaq.
13
                 Mr. Goltz, good morning.
14
                 THE DEFENDANT: Good morning.
15
                 THE COURT: I'm sorry?
16
                 THE DEFENDANT: Good morning.
17
                 THE COURT: Please tell me your full name.
18
                 THE DEFENDANT: Frederick Francis Goltz.
19
                 THE COURT: Mr. Goltz, you previously appeared
20
     before Magistrate Judge Bryant back in late April. You pled
21
     quilty to Count 1 of the indictment charging you with
     interstate threatening communications, in violation of federal
22
2.3
     law.
24
                 Judge Bryant found that your guilty plea was
25
     knowing and voluntary and supported by a sufficient factual
```

```
1
     basis, so he recommended that I accept your guilty plea, and I
 2
      did. On May 11th, I entered an order accepting your plea, and
 3
      I adjudged you quilty of the crime alleged in the indictment
 4
     against you.
 5
                 Now, sir, I know it's the first time you and I are
      actually seeing each other during this process, but I want you
 6
      to know I'm very familiar with your case. The Court has
 7
      reviewed all these materials, and I'm ready to proceed today.
 8
9
      Okay?
10
                 THE DEFENDANT: Okay.
11
                 THE COURT: Mr. King, have you had an opportunity
12
      to read the PSR, its addendum, and its second addendum and
13
      discuss those with your client?
14
                 MR. KING: I have, Your Honor.
15
                 THE COURT: Mr. Goltz, have you had an opportunity
16
      to read your presentence report, its addendum, and its second
17
      addendum and have a chance to talk about those with your
18
     attorney?
19
                 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
20
                 THE COURT: You understand we're here so I can
21
      decide what sentence to impose?
22
                 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
23
                 THE COURT: All right, Mr. King. You filed
24
     multiple objections to the presentence report. Let me see if I
25
      can clear away some of the underbrush.
```

```
1
                 There were three clarifying objections regarding
      certain statements about potential suicidal ideation,
 2
      children's ages, and CBD gummies. Those have been adopted by
 3
      the addendum. They have no impact. Those have been rendered
 4
 5
     moot, I believe. Is that correct?
                 MR. KING: That is correct, Your Honor.
 6
 7
                 THE COURT: All right. There are two objections to
      conditions -- potential conditions of supervision regarding new
8
9
      credit charges and financial reporting. I don't intend to
10
      impose those, so those are also moot. Do you agree?
11
                 MR. KING: That would be correct, Your Honor.
12
                 THE COURT: All right. You have a clarifying
13
      objection about potential immigration consequences. You agree
14
      with the presentence report, but you request inclusion of a
15
     statement that he made during rearraignment explaining that he
16
     was not conceding he was removable.
17
                 Probation tells me it should not be included; it
18
     has no impact.
19
                 Would you like to be heard further on that?
20
                 MR. KING: Your Honor, I think the objection to the
21
      statements-- Paragraph 6 and paragraph 88 are very similar in
22
     nature. Both paragraphs 6 and 88 make a conclusion that
23
     Mr. Goltz is removable. Specifically, paragraph 88 makes the
24
     statement he is deportable because he is an aggravated felon.
25
                 Certainly, Mr. Goltz has not conceded that this
```

conviction is an aggravated felon. The use--that we-- We have employed an immigration attorney. His conclusion has also been that it's not an aggravated felony.

The government, in their response to the objections, has stated that they agree with our objection, with the caveat that Mr. Goltz's immigration status is subject to a separate hearing. And we agree with that also, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah. Nothing I do today would bind that separate proceeding.

MR. KING: The concern, Your Honor, is, it is my understanding that the immigration courts can use a--documents from a district court case, to include the presentence report. And there would be nothing that we would want to concede within the immigration--because we understand, after we complete this court--this case in this court, that we will likely find ourselves in front of an immigration judge, and we wouldn't want the immigration judge to say, you didn't object to paragraph 88 where you conceded you were an aggravated felon.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, my plan--I want to hear from the United States, but my tentative conclusion is to deny your request for a clarification, because the plea agreement and the PSR make clear that no one can predict with certainty the effect of the conviction on immigration status. I don't think-- I agree with the probation officer; there's not a need to clarify it further. Clearly, during that separate

1 proceeding, the defendant will say, I don't concede that and I 2 didn't concede that. And nothing in the PSR or the plea 3 agreement imply such a concession. As far as paragraph 88 and the deportability, I 4 5 don't think it's necessary for me to resolve that. I'm not 6 going to say one way or the other. It's a complex issue, and I don't want to--I don't want to give any indication one way or 7 another of what I think and get out ahead of that. And so 8 9 under Rule--Criminal Rule 32(i)(3)(B), I think it's an 10 unnecessary objection. I just don't plan to resolve it. 11 Am I missing something, Mr. Haag? 12 MR. HAAG: No, Your Honor. I think that is an 13 appropriate approach in this case.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, the clarification—the requested clarification to paragraph 6 is denied, and the objection to paragraph 88 regarding deportability I find is unnecessary to resolve, and it's not going to affect the sentence that I impose today.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

All right. There was also a potential--or proposed clarification to paragraph 80 just about the post office box address. Defendant claims he no longer rents that. There's no impact on the guidelines here.

Would you like to be heard on that, Mr. King?

MR. KING: Your Honor, it is just trying to provide

as clear of information as we can to the Court. I searched

```
1
     LCAD, the Lubbock Central Appraisal District. It does list
 2
      this. I've talked with Mrs. Goltz, trying to figure out why
 3
      this property is listed. A Google search of the address shows
 4
      that that address is a Pack-a-Mail on 98th Street.
                                                          That
 5
      Pack-a-Mail certainly isn't owned by Mr. Goltz.
                 Again, ultimately, Your Honor, it was just to do
 6
      our best to ensure that all of the facts within the presentence
 7
      report are true and correct. Mr. Goltz has no value in any
 8
9
     property that is located at that address.
10
                 THE COURT: All right. I'm going to overrule the
11
      objection. The PSR is presumed reliable unless there's
12
     evidence rebutting it. I don't think there's sufficient
13
      evidence here. It's not going to impact anything anyway.
14
      know the defendant argues he no longer has that P.O. box, but
15
      there are indications otherwise.
16
                 Okay. Let's turn to your primary objection and one
17
      that would impact the advisory quideline range, and that is
18
```

whether he made more than two threats during this offense. Would you like to be heard further on that?

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KING: Yes, Your Honor. And I'll state for the Court, this is an interesting and complicated issue, one unlike most of my objections to presentence reports.

The first objection, Your Honor--well, the first argument within the objection to the more than two threats is that there are many statements that are included within this

offense, but those statements do not meet the definition of a true threat.

While I've never seen it argued in front of any court, much less decided in front of any court, it would be our position and our argument that the definition of "true threat" includes—is, the more than true threats, that those—the more than two threats, that those more than two threats have to be true threats. It's not just anything that could be considered threatening.

And as the objection to the second addendum explains, the definition of "true threat" has been laid out through case law within the Supreme Court. In the second addendum to the presentence report, the second addendum incorrectly uses Black's Law Dictionary. It doesn't go through a process of the subjective and objective requirements of a true threat. It simply states, well, if something seems threatening or of malice, then it qualifies. And we would argue for the Court, on a basic principle, that true threats are more defined than what the second addendum attempts to do.

Then looking at the second addendum and the response from the government is that all of these statements included are separate threats. But the government has made the argument that statements can become a threat, or a true threat, by looking at their context. And then the government has cited--uses other statements that Mr. Goltz has made to explain

why that is a threat.

And we agree with that proposition. The case law says, look at the context of the statements. You can't cherry-pick and pull out this one statement and say, well, it's not a true threat because it doesn't contain all the factors within that statement. You have to look at the context.

Then the government and the second addendum say, well, then, we're going to use these statements that provided context and say that they are additional threats also.

Specifically, Your Honor, when you look at the statement of— One of the posts is that children—"If children are killed, that will burn into the memories of people." That is certainly a vile statement. Within that statement, there is no threat. There's no children that are referenced. There's no—there's nothing—there's not the specificity required within a threat.

Now, we recognize that that statement provides context for the offense to which Mr. Goltz pleaded guilty and that those statements together—somebody has children; murdering children is burned into the memory—we recognize that those statements go together, and that's why Mr. Goltz has pleaded guilty.

But what the addendum--the second addendum states and the government states is, well, look at this one statement and look at the second statement; we combine them and make a

threat, and then we're going to separate them and then count them as two threats.

And it would be our argument that those other statements—the vile nature of hurting children—that those do provide the context, but it doesn't—it's not providing an additional threat. If you were to look at the initial statement, then the argument would be that's not a threat. We've conceded that, in the context, that these are threats.

Additionally, Your Honor, just as—not reading through all of them, but the second amendment lists the statement, "We are in dire need of a real Holocaust this time." Your Honor, that's—it's vile. It's difficult to say. It's not a true threat. There is nobody that has been singled out. The government makes the argument, well, groups can be included as part of a threat, but they have to be identifiable groups.

There is not an identifiable group. Again, the Probation Department was put to the task of identifying which statements were threats, and they listed all of the statements. And, Your Honor, within that list, there are statements—again, the two that I've highlighted for the Court—that our argument, Your Honor, are not true threats.

We're not denying that they were said. Mr. Goltz made all of those statements. But within the legal analysis from the Supreme Court of what is defined as a true threat, it is our position that those don't meet that definition.

Your Honor, the second argument is related to the application note within Section 2A6.1, which limits the conduct that a court is to consider in determining relevant conduct within Section 2A6.1. And I hesitate to use the term "relevant conduct," because we so often use the definition within 1B1.3 for relevant conduct; all acts, omissions, aided, abetted, counseled, committed, induced, procured by the defendant or by co-conspirators. The application note within Section 2A6.1 limits the conduct to conduct that is substantially and directly related to the offense of conviction.

I will be honest with the Court again. I, in my practice, have been aware that relevant conduct, the 1B1.3 definition, states that it applies to all of the guidelines unless a guideline provides for a separate definition.

This is the first time, to my knowledge, that I've worked with a guideline that says, we are not going to use 1B1.3; we are going to provide for a specific explanation of what conduct is to be viewed. And that conduct that is to be viewed is conduct that is substantially and directly related to the offense.

The second addendum doesn't even address this portion of the objection. The government's response actually demonstrates, in my argument, Your Honor, that the objection should be granted. The government responds and says that this offense was not an offense as they stated in Count 1 of the

indictment; that this offense is an offense against election officials and poll workers in Nevada and Arizona and that this was part of an attempt to counter the election results in Nevada and Arizona.

That is not what the government charged in the indictment. The government has stated, we've charged the specific threat, these specific statements—that's what was pled to in Count 1. And Count 2 was dismissed. The factual resumé doesn't state this, threats of an attempt to modify these elections.

The government even broadened Section 1B1.3 and goes the opposite way. We have a limiting instruction from the guidelines, and then the government makes an attempt to make that even broader than what it is.

It would be our argument that when you look at that limiting instruction and then what Mr. Goltz pleaded guilty to, that, again, in looking at the spectrum of the threats that are the true threats related to T.L., that that enhancement doesn't apply. Again, it doesn't diminish the other statements, the vileness, but as applied within the guidelines.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr. King.

Mr. Haaq?

MR. HAAG: Yes, Your Honor. The United States has fully set out its argument in Document 49, and we have identified for the Court the specific statements that, in our

opinion, constitute the more than two threats in this case.

In order to make that assessment, the Court does have to look at the context of Mr. Goltz' other statements.

And when you look at the full context of his other statements, you see the threatening nature of those comments. And I'll talk just a little bit about three that occurred prior to the threat in Count 1.

First is the threat on November 14th of 2022 where Mr. Goltz says, "Hypothetically, a mass shooting of poll workers and election officials in these highly suspect precincts might be the way to go."

Second, on November 16th, 2022, he posts this comment: Maricopa--about Maricopa County Live Meeting, and he states, "Someone should have just walked in and shot them all. They're all trash."

Third, when there's a post, "How on earth is it that the people of Arizona could possibly be satisfied with Katie Hobbs as governor," Mr. Goltz posted, "I was thinking more along the lines of a loud boom and brain matter splattered all over the sidewalk, but that's just my guess."

And to determine whether this is relevant conduct, you look, is there a substantial connection between all of these threats. And there is. The common thread between all of them is, it is threats aimed towards election results in Nevada and Arizona in 2022.

1 Nothing further, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to overrule the 3 objections for the reasons stated by the probation officer, the government, and for the reasons I state today. I understand 4 5 your legal arguments. I do find that there are true threats here, and there are multiple threats here. The offense 6 involved threats towards election officials and poll workers in 7 multiple locations. The government points to the defendant's 8 9 own statements to support, including the following: 10 Again, "Hypothetically, a mass shooting of poll workers and election officials in these highly suspect 11 12 precincts may be the way to go." 13 Two, the Katie Hobbs statement. He says, "I was 14 thinking more along the lines of a loud boom, brain matter 15 splattered across the sidewalk." 16 Three, regarding a county official, "It would be a 17 shame if someone got to his children. There are some crazies out there. This kind of info shouldn't be readily available on 18 19 the internet." 20 Four, regarding another county official, "He has 21 got a wife that's a lawyer. We need to find out her name and where she works. I don't think he has kids, but I'm not 22 23 100 percent on that." 24 Five, in response to the statement from another 25 person that kids should be off limits -- and again, these

statements provide context--"No. Nothing is off limits. It's people like you that are supposedly with us who don't have the stomach to do whatever it takes to get our country back."

Six, he says, "The children are the most important ones to get, because it sends a message 100 years into the future that people will pay the price for the sins of the father. Dead children burn into the memories of people. Dead adults are forgotten much easier."

Later statements indicate that these are true threats, including the following: He says, "Yeah, but when it's me, I'm willing to take lives. That's the difference. If you're being unfairly and illegally persecuted, it's built right into the Constitution that you're supposed to protect yourself against a tyrannical government. This means their children are not off limits either."

Again, I find that these are true threats under the current case law. Just as one example, in *United States vs.*Murillo, M-u-r-i-l-l-o, the defendant made two threats directed at a management team where he worked. It is a Fifth Circuit case from 2000. The defendant there stated, "If I had a gun, I would Glock out the whole management team." And in an email, he said he would fix management's wagon for trying to fire him, and "your wagon will get burned."

The Fifth Circuit upheld the district court's finding that these were threats under the guideline, warranting

the enhancement.

And again, here, the defendant has many statements targeting specific individuals and their families, and the threats are much more detailed than the threats involved in *Murillo*. His additional statements further support that he intended them to be true threats, and these threats occurred during this offense.

There's no indication that the guidelines require the threats to be directed at solely one victim, and I disagree with your interpretation of the guideline and its commentary. And moreover, in *Murillo*, the Fifth Circuit upheld the enhancement when that threat was broadly directed at the management team.

Finally, although it provides context, it takes a particular amount of chutzpah to argue that calling for a Holocaust is not targeting any particular group of people.

Just two days before he made the Holocaust statement--clearly, the Holocaust is a reference to the Jewish people--he said, about a particular American Jewish politician, "I want to throw that Jew in an oven so badly I can taste it."

For all those reasons, the objection is overruled.

I think that takes care of all of your objections.

Am I missing any, Mr. King?

MR. KING: Your Honor, just for the record, there was--the first addendum made a correction to paragraph 85. We

```
1
      did not object to that, but the first addendum had made that
 2
      correction--
 3
                 THE COURT: Okay. Yeah, and there's no objection
      from the government about that correction. Correct?
 4
 5
                 MR. HAAG: That is correct, Your Honor.
                 THE COURT: Yeah, and I will accept that in the
 6
7
      addendum as well. Okay. Thank you, Mr. King.
                 Any objections from the United States?
 8
 9
                 MR. HAAG: No, Your Honor.
10
                 THE COURT: The Court, having resolved all
11
      objections to the PSR, its addendum and second addendum, I do
12
      adopt them all, their factual findings and legal conclusions,
13
     as my own.
14
                 All right. Mr. Goltz, thank you for your patience
15
     with that. I am required to resolve all these objections.
16
     Both parties get to make whatever they would like, but I have
17
     to resolve them before we can proceed.
                 Now that I've done that, I will tell you that your
18
19
     statutory sentencing range, or the total possible range of
20
     punishment, is a term of imprisonment of not more than 5 years;
21
     a fine of $250,000; and a period of supervised release of up to
22
      3 years.
23
                 Under the guidelines manual, we have a total
      offense level of 17; a criminal history category of I; and that
24
25
      results in an advisory guideline range of 24 to 30 months'
```

imprisonment.

Now, the probation officer notes that there are certain factors here that might warrant an upward departure or an upward variance from that advisory guideline range; in particular, that there are aggravating circumstances that were not taken into account in calculating that advisory range.

In particular, the probation officer notes for me that you targeted children in your threatening communications; you posted one victim's personal information on the internet, including that victim's address; and that those circumstances were not taken into consideration in calculating the quidelines.

In light of those circumstances, in light of the number of threatening communications, the particularly violent nature of the number of those communications, I have tentatively concluded that an upward variance or an upward departure might be warranted here. I've not made a final decision on that, and I'll hear both sides out.

So, Mr. King, I'm in receipt of your sentencing memorandum. I understand the arguments within it. I'm also in receipt of your second sentencing memo, which has the 25 character letters and many photos, and the third sentencing memo provides the three additional character letters. But I would be glad to hear any additional evidence or argument you have on behalf of your client.

1 Thank you, Your Honor. And just to be MR. KING: 2 clear with where I am in my procedure, Your Honor, I understand 3 that we have a sentencing memo where we have requested a downward variance. And if I may, for the Court, my argument 4 5 for the ultimate sentence and for the downward variance all combine, and if I may just address those at the same time. 6 7 THE COURT: You may. MR. KING: Thank you, Your Honor. And we also--8 9 we've provided notice to the Court. After my brief argument 10 for the Court, we have three character witnesses that wish to 11 address the Court, and Mr. Goltz also wishes to address the 12 Court. 13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 MR. KING: Thank you, Your Honor. 15 The Court has referenced the 25, plus the 3, 16 letters which have been submitted. I had contemplated, as I've 17 pondered and tried to figure out my best way to present who 18 Mr. Goltz is to this Court, reading each one of those letters 19 to the Court out loud. They are some of the most thoughtful, 20 heartfelt, insightful group of character reference letters I've 21 put together. 22 Mr. Goltz is magnetic. People are drawn to him. 23 He doesn't just pass people as he goes by them in the street. People get to know who he is. The letters from friends and 24

family, they know he's going to be at the games. They know

25

he's at the volleyball games. They know he's at the practice. They know he's picking up the kids from school. They know, when they're out working on their yard, Freddy is walking down to help them work on their yard.

When families call up the Goltz family and say,

"We're lost; we've been diagnosed with cancer," Freddy doesn't

just say, "I'm offering my prayers and concerns." Freddy says,

"I'm going to go and do research," and he does, and he gives

that back to the family and provides them hope and love and

consolation. This is just who he is.

The letters, time and time again, explain that when kids show up at practice and they don't have what he needs, Freddy goes—not his kids. Freddy goes and takes care of other people's kids. He goes to events where his kids aren't even playing and he makes an appearance, and he roots for kids that are not his kids because he loves and supports them. In the courtroom today are his five children, his in-laws, eight neighbors, five family friends, and his wife. Every hearing we've had, they have shown up in support.

The interesting point of the letter, Your Honor, is, the people who write those letters one-hundred-percent know what Freddy did. Most of the letters address: I'm embarrassed, I'm appalled, I'm hurt by the things that Freddy said. It wasn't sugarcoated. It wasn't glossed over. But those letters also say, I still know who Freddy is; he is still my neighbor;

he's still my dad; he's still my husband; I still love him. He is still the magnetic personality that they all knew him to be.

And then it begs the question, Your Honor, how are we standing here in front of the Court? Fifty-one years, he has never been in trouble, and for the first time, days before Christmas, he's arrested after dropping his kids off at school. He has missed the first Christmas, and he now stands facing a federal sentencing and possible deportation.

Mr. Goltz found himself in a world that we're warned of, in a world that I warn my children of. He found himself in a downward spiral of this social media echo chamber. It can't be minimized where Mr. Goltz found himself. And he went from Twitter to Gab, to Gab to-- It continued to go downhill.

The Surgeon General has just released a report.

And this report targets youth, but youth that spend three and a half hours on social media per day have double the likelihood of having a mental health problem, a mental health crisis.

Double. While that applies to youth, I can't say it wouldn't apply to me also, and I certainly can't say that it doesn't apply to Mr. Goltz.

The statements that he said are vile. This Court has stated them. I have read them over and over again. But courts are called, within the 3553(a) factors, to look at the history and circumstances of the defendant. And when you look

at Mr. Goltz, it's overwhelming. It's hard to understand all that he has done for his family and for his neighbors. He is—and I won't steal his words, but he is humbly apologetic.

The government states in their response that somebody with children should know, and he does now. He found himself behind a keyboard and behind a screen, and with the false bravado and the anonymity-- He said to me when I talked to him yesterday, "I said things that I never would have said to somebody in person," because that's not who he is. It's not who he was. He was wrong.

We've asked for a sentence of 12 months and one day. We've heard that the Court has tentatively considered an upward departure. It's a very interesting situation where the feelings and emotions are so pulled apart in a case. I recognize that, again, we have a report of vile things and a heartfelt statement about the guy with the SLR camera who takes pictures of all the kids.

We just ask the Court to truly examine those factors about what people had to say about him, recognize that the lesson that has been learned has been learned forever in Mr. Goltz. Words hurt. It's a lesson that I teach my 12-year-old and my 16-year-old. You can't say anything you want to online. He has learned those lessons.

We ask the Court to find that that 12 months and a day is sufficient. Your--

```
1
                 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr.-- I'm sorry.
 2
                 MR. KING: Thank you, Your Honor. And so I don't
 3
      forget, we would request a nonbinding recommendation to
 4
     FCI Big Spring.
 5
                 THE COURT: That's granted.
                 MR. KING: And, Your Honor, the first witness that
 6
     we would ask to call would be Emilee Goltz.
7
                 THE COURT: All right. I will consider all of that
 8
9
     argument, as you have requested, and I'd be glad to hear from
10
     Miss Goltz.
11
                 MR. KING: Thank you, Your Honor.
12
                 THE COURT: If y'all would have a seat, please.
13
           (PAUSE)
14
                 THE COURT: Good morning.
15
                 EMILEE GOLTZ: Good morning.
                 THE COURT: Is it Emilee Goltz?
16
17
                 EMILEE GOLTZ: Emilee, yes.
                 THE COURT: Emilee. Thank you for being here. I
18
19
     appreciate it. Go ahead.
20
           (PAUSE)
21
                 EMILEE GOLTZ: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I'm so--
22
                 THE COURT: It's okay. No apology necessary. Just
23
     take a deep breath. There's a Kleenex there if you need it.
24
                 EMILEE GOLTZ: So I am my dad's oldest daughter.
25
     I've never met anyone who has been so caring and compassionate.
```

Like, growing up, always at my games. Never missed a single one. If he wasn't there— Personally, me, I would get annoyed when he'd come, because I—the only person I could hear in the crowd was him. But if a game went by where my dad wasn't there or he was late or just being quiet, parents, teammates, friends from other schools who knew my dad would come up and, like, they would just ask where he is, because it was so out of the—out of the ordinary that he wouldn't be there for every single game. And, of course, he's the loudest, because he's just so compassionate and just so involved in everything that we've ever done.

I--a bunch of my friends that I still talk to, growing up with--I moved away about four years ago, but I--the amount of pictures and videos that I get of my friends just hanging out at the house. And I'm, like, oh, like, are you going over there to see my sisters? Are you going to see my--No, I'm just hanging out with your dad, just hanging out in the garage, catching up on life, because he is one who just takes them in as his own. He has six kids as it is. I mean, five of us are here, but--including my friends, my siblings' friends, he has got a lot more than just six kids biologically.

He--one of my friends, when we were younger, her parents were going through a really bad divorce, and she was just kind of stuck and just didn't know where to go. And my dad took her under her wing, and eventually, like, she talked

about him as her dad, claims him as her dad, still talks to him, will still call him when she needs help. She called him when--didn't call me. Called him when she was stuck in the middle of something that she didn't need to be in and she didn't want to call her parents. She didn't call anyone else. The first person she called was my dad, because he will drop everything to come and help you out, whether he knows you that well or not. But if he knows that his kids care about you, his wife, his friends care about you, he will be there no matter what.

He-- Breakfast in the morning was always made.

Always made us breakfast, every single morning. If-- I had a friend that got grounded, so she wasn't allowed to drive, so she would be dropped off at my house every morning, and he'd have her breakfast waiting too.

He would show up to all of the games, whether--like Michael said, whether we were there or not, if we were playing or not. If we had friends that he had met through our club teams who played at different schools, he would go and watch their games. I graduated four years ago, and he was still going to the basketball games even after I graduated and none of us were playing, simply because of the relationships he has made with my former teammates and their parents on the team.

It's unfortunate that y'all only know him from what's on paper. It's very unfortunate, because if y'all had a

```
1
     chance to meet him personally, you would probably be best
 2
     friends. He would care for you like he cares for everyone else
 3
     in his life.
                 And, Dad, I love you. So dumb, but I still love
 4
 5
     you. And I'm sorry. That's all I have to say.
 6
                 THE COURT: Okay. Emilee, thank you for being here
     today. You're lucky your--I'm sorry--your father is lucky to
 7
     have a daughter like you who's willing to come and speak on his
 8
9
     behalf. So I appreciate it, and I will take all that into
10
     consideration.
11
                 EMILEE GOLTZ: Thank you.
12
                 THE COURT: All right. Mr. King, who is next?
13
                 MR. KING: Thank you, Your Honor. Scott Leech.
14
           (PAUSE)
15
                 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Leech.
16
                 MR. LEECH: Good morning. How are you doing?
17
                 THE COURT: Good. Is it L-e-a-c-h?
18
                 MR. LEECH: L-e-e-c-h.
19
                 THE COURT: I'm sorry?
20
                 MR. LEECH: L-e-e-c-h.
21
                 THE COURT: L-e-e. Okay. Thank you. Go ahead,
22
     sir.
23
                 MR. LEECH: I've got a letter here--I've got a
24
     letter here, because if I don't read, I'll forget everything,
25
     so--
```

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LEECH: Your Honor, I'm Freddy's friend, neighbor, and former business partner. I'm here today to let you know a little bit about the Freddy that I've known for the past 14 years.

First and foremost, Freddy is a family man. He and his wife Laura have been married for 24 years, and together, they have five children together, ranging in ages from eleven to twenty-two years old. As you've heard earlier, Freddy is very involved in all the daily activities of his family. He and Laura take the kids to school in the morning, they pick them up in the afternoon, and as Emilee just said, if there's an after-school sporting event, he always makes it to the games.

In the evenings, you can usually see him outside, shooting hoops with his youngest son J.G. or playing volleyball with his girls and their friends, or just simply grilling out for everybody. Freddy has always been such a huge part of our neighborhood and our community. Most people put a fire pit in their back yard, but not Freddy. He put one in his front yard to welcome all his friends and neighbors over. If the fire is going, there's never a need for an invitation; just go on over.

He's always looking out for his family and friends, especially kids. I'm talking about everybody's kids. I've actually coached with Freddy and I've seen how good he is with

children and how they respond to him. I've seen a guy who is extremely passionate about life, with tons of charisma, who loves his family. He puts one-hundred-percent effort into everything he does.

Freddy has a very energetic and fun personality. In these past 14 years, I've never ever seen him be violent. I've never seen him get into any type of physical altercation with anyone. Before this particular incident, he has had a clean record for 51 years. The Freddy that I know is not and has never been a risk to himself or to others. I know that he would never ever again put his family or his freedom in jeopardy, and I know that all, right now, he wants to do is be reunited with his family. I pray that day comes sooner than later.

And I know the--I know that it has kind of been made out like he's some type of monster. He is not. If you knew this guy, he is a stand-up guy. I've lived right across the street from him for the past 14 years. Some of the stuff that was said, I think the bark is bigger than the bite. Sometimes you get down a rabbit hole, with COVID and not--too much time on your hands. He's a staunch Republican, and sometimes things get taken a little too far, and sometimes way too far. But I just hope that you show him mercy.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LEECH: Thank you.

```
1
                 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Leech, thank you for
 2
     being here. I appreciate that.
 3
                 All right. Who is next, Mr. King? Last one.
                 MR. KING: Thank you, Your Honor. Yes, the last
 4
 5
           Mrs. Goltz.
     one.
 6
                 THE COURT: Good morning, Mrs. Goltz.
 7
                 LAURA GOLTZ: Good morning.
                 THE COURT: Will you tell me your first name,
 8
9
     please.
10
                 LAURA GOLTZ: Laura.
11
                 THE COURT: Thank you.
12
                 LAURA GOLTZ: Laura Goltz. Freddy and I-- I'm
13
     Freddy's wife. And I do have paper, too, because I'm not good
14
     at this.
15
                 Freddy and I have been married for 24 years, and we
16
     have five children together. And again, we just want you to
17
     know the Freddy that we know and share a little bit about who
18
     he is as a person, not who he was or who--the words that he
19
     used online.
20
                 As said, from the early days of our marriage,
21
     Freddy's heart was always evident. The company that I worked
22
     for at the time was a big supporter of Elf Louise in
23
     San Antonio. And Elf Louise, they do Christmas gifts for
24
     underprivileged kids. We were assigned to a section downtown.
25
     Freddy and I went. We got our bag of gifts. Freddy pulled on
```

his Santa suit, we hopped in the car and away we went. Had no clue what to expect.

When we got to the apartment complex and pulled in, all the kids came running. And Santa Freddy got out of the car and sat and talked. We had a bag--one bag of gifts. Every kid that was there, Freddy sat and talked to. When we ran out of gifts, he still sat and talked to them. What should have been a two-hour tour--or two-hour delivery took us over five hours, just because Freddy took the time to sit, talk, and encourage all of these kids.

When we moved to Midland, Freddy was at—I think it was Wal—Mart. Freddy can talk to anybody. And he was talking to a gentleman at Wal—Mart and found out that he was a vet and he was in town for the Show of Support hunt. Freddy started asking questions, asking questions, well, what about this, what about that. He's, like, it's a perfect opportunity. He volunteered every year for that hunt when we were there just so that he could sit and talk to people and understand them, one on one, talk to people face—to—face.

When we moved to Lubbock, that's when the kids started sports, and Freddy jumped in. He coached football, basketball, and baseball when they were younger. And when they outgrew his coaching acumen, he became the team dad. He was at every event, and he's loud. My Lord, is he ever loud. I have to sit on the other side of the gym from him. But he's there

so he can support those kids and the coaches.

Freddy is the dad that drives behind the bus when they're driving to--50-mile-an-hour school bus between here and Dallas, to make sure--or here and Bastrop, here and wherever, to make sure--follow the bus. If anything happens, he wants to be there.

At one of the tournaments in Dallas--it was a big basketball tournament. Freddy was--he goes and talks to everybody. He went in and noticed that there were no fans in the stand for these poor girls that were out playing. So Freddy stayed, watched every one of their games, learned all of their names, had signs--went and made signs, and by the end of the tournament, half of the girls from our team were part of that team, cheering in the stands.

He's a loyal and caring friend, and he selfishly supports those going through hard times, offering a helping hand and listening. When our neighbor who is here today was going through a terrible divorce and was--Freddy, every night, would put the kids down and go and stay with Pete so he wasn't by himself. That's just what Freddy is. That's what Freddy does.

Another friend fell upon hard times, didn't have a place to live. Freddy took our RV, drove it to the RV park, paid all the lot fees, put groceries in the RV so he had a place to stay so that he wouldn't have to leave town, knowing

that his kids--this is where his kids were growing up.

He's always been a straightforward person, I mean, to his kids, and, like Emilee said, even--I mean, anytime those kids had a hard time, they knew who to call. They would call Fred all hours of the day, morning. He would go and get them, bring them back. They knew that there were consequences. They were going to have to tell their parents. But they knew that they had a safe person to call.

Oh, and he's very--or he's very involved in our neighborhood. Our neighbors moved in down the street--or our next-door neighbors moved in maybe seven, eight years ago, and they let Freddy know, hey, we're going to be out of town for the weekend. We live on a cul-de-sac, and they live at the end of the cul-de-sac. Well, Freddy noticed that there was a strange car down there, so he gets on the golf cart, drives down, and he's--who are you? Nice to meet you. Come to find out, it was his--it was our neighbor's mom. She was a little offended at first, but she realized that he's just there to protect their family. I think he actually did the same thing to Joel's dad, as well, when he showed up.

But he--yeah, I--and very caring. Our neighbor
Linda is a cancer survivor. Her husband Lotty [phonetic] is a
retired B-52 bomber. They are older, but they love to do
things in their yard. Linda loves to plant. Lotty will drive
up with a trailer full of bags of sod. Freddy helps back the

1 trailer in and he's there to help them pull everything off the 2 trailer. He does not let Linda get up on a ladder. 3 Bobby, our other neighbor, he's constantly helping him with the horses. He's very--a very, very caring person. 4 5 I don't know why Freddy wrote the things he did. That's not who Freddy is. He's not out organizing political 6 rallies or functions or anything like that. He's organizing 7 where the kids are going to eat dinner before Belles and Beauxs 8 9 dances. He's organizing where are we going to take pictures, 10 how are we going to do this for our friends and neighbors. 11 The past few years, it's been physically and 12 mentally tough on everybody. In these challenges, sometimes you just need a release. I don't know if this was his release, 13 14 but I know that that's not who he is. And I hope that you can 15 take the time and you've listened and you've read the letters 16 and understand who Freddy is as a genuine person. 17 He has got a huge heart for others, full of 18 compassion and dedicated to his family, friends, and community. 19 I just ask that you give him a chance and allow him to learn 20 from these mistakes and grow as an individual and make the best 21 out of a bad situation. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mrs. Goltz. I have listened, and I appreciate you being here.

LAURA GOLTZ: Thank you.

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right, Mr. King. Your client would

like to make a statement?

MR. KING: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right, Mr. Goltz. You do have the right to tell me anything you'd like to tell me. It sounds like there is something you'd like to say. Go ahead.

THE DEFENDANT: It's going to be tough.

I don't want to get into relitigating all these points that they go back and forth on. My lawyer says things that I scratch my head at sometimes, but I know it's how you guys do things here in the court. And I scratch my head at some of the things the prosecutor says about my statements, but I know it's how you guys do things here in the court. And when I bring my car to the mechanic, I don't sit over his shoulder and tell him what to do, so I just sort of throw my shoulders up in the air and let them do their thing.

But the only thing I want to say about a lot of those comments, however vile they may be, is that I heard the word "context" a lot, but nobody ever went down the rabbit hole of context. I'm not saying all of those are innocent comments, but what I am saying, a lot of them—for example, the—Okay. I've been a writer for 25 years. That's why I quit playing hockey. I write—I write over—the—top comedies, comedy sketches, teleplays, TV pilots. That over—the—top energy is what I take with me everywhere.

The first headline after I was arrested was the one

that referenced the antisemitic Holocaust; in effect, rendering a 25-year body of writing work completely useless. It's a paperweight now, and that's fine. That's fine. Nobody ever asked why I said that. It was a digital tongue-in-cheek response to a gay Jewish professor at a university who had called for the eradication of heterosexual males, something ridiculous of that nature. So I responded ridiculously in kind with, "We need another Holocaust," I mean, never knowing those words would come back to bite me as they did. And that's all I'm going to say about the kind of context that—and the intellectual dishonesty that some of those appear to have been presented in.

But other than that, you know, my wife said, you know, we've been married for 24 years, and we've been together since '95, almost three decades. And I think the longest I've been away from her is six days. That happened one time back in the nineties. This entire past eight months or so has just been a complete shock, a surreal experience that I'm still—just to be here in a yellow jumpsuit and shackles in front of a federal judge and my family, my neighbors, it's unbelievable. And when I say that, I mean it's literally not to be believed.

Everything about my life that they were talking about, I love doing it. I love sharing all that with my wife, from getting up early in the mornings, making breakfast, to tag-teaming the lunches, to get the backpacks ready for the

day, to get the kids' teeth brushed and get them off to school and enjoy that 15 minutes of a captive audience that I have with them on the way there and then get that 15 minutes again on the way home. I love all of that.

The things I said were just idiotic and reckless and stupid. Some of them came from frustration. Some of them came, like I said, tongue-in-cheek. But combined, they--I--in the magistrate judge's court, I heard them reading those all off. I mean, to combine 20 comments from tens of thousands, I was starting to question myself when he reads them all off in a row. They're horrible.

There's been some good come of the last three-quarters of a year, I guess. I tend, in these times, to see nothing but the negative, but my wife tends to see the positive, no matter what, in things. And she reminded me of one of the most positive things. I mean, the last year has been pretty humbling, for sure, but--or eight months. But the most humbling thing probably started the day of my arrest, actually, and I didn't find out till later. But, you know, it's when people start--shortly after school got out, people start showing up at my house. Neighbors and, you know, old business partners and new business partners, friends, even teachers. I don't know how they heard so fast, but, you know, kids from the neighborhood would roll up on golf carts to take my daughters on golf cart rides to take their mind off their

dad getting arrested.

And, you know, just three days after that, a couple of volleyball moms show up on a Friday to take my kids away for weekend sleepovers so that my wife could wrap her head around the chaos and prepare for the legal fight that was going to happen and the financial burden that was going to place on us with five kids and two in college, you know.

And to have those people in your life, I didn't really know I had——I didn't really realize that I had that support and that kind of loyalty from my friends. And when my wife mentioned that—— You know, I truly feel blessed to have those people in my life. And some of them are here right now, and if I have embarrassed them or hurt them in any way, I apologize.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Goltz. I appreciate that statement. Is there anything else about this case?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, yes, I would like to, you know, address something else. You know, it brings me to Mr. Liddy, who is here today to give his testimony, too, and can't blame him for that. But it doesn't detract from the fact that I owe him an apology. And when I was thinking about what I was going to say and how I wronged him, there were some pretty striking parallels to, you know, what's happened to me since my arrest. And I don't know if that's karma or just

desserts or whatever it is.

But, you know, the first thing--the very first thing that I could think of was the video, the famous video that was being commented on and shared. And when I was thinking about it, it wasn't even a full video. It was a clip of a video. To my memory, it was part of a phone call, which means we didn't see anything that led up to it. We didn't hear anything of the conversation. We don't even know who made the call, and, you know, that's out of context.

And I know something about being taken out of context, but usually, I'm the kind of guy that I'm--I'm a skeptic, and I would say, well, listen, you know, let's step back here; where's the rest of the phone call; you know, who made the call; what was said before that. But for whatever reason, I didn't.

So I apologize for that aspect of it, which, you know, right after that, right after I finished watching the video, I clicked into the comments section and, I mean, he was already deluged with all these comments and people sharing personal information and whatnot. And again, I just read a couple dozen comments, saw the tone, and just threw stuff against the wall to see what would stick and—when I should have been taking a step back and, you know, saying, well, where is this guy; why can't we hear from him, you know, about what this is about; you know, we're jumping on this guy; we're

dog-piling him, you know, without him being here to defend himself. And just to dog-pile somebody like that is pretty gutless, you know. And so I--that's the second thing I apologize for.

But, you know, the thing that really struck me was, when I was first arrested, I'm sitting in a jail cell, and I was already under water, you know, my head spinning, and it was a very desperate time for me. And I knew that my immigration was in jeopardy, so my family was in jeopardy.

And on top of that, at nighttime, when it was bed-when I should have been putting my kids to bed, locking the
doors and whatnot, all I could think about was, what if
something happened. What if somebody tried to break in, or
what if there was a fire, you know, and I wasn't there because
of the stupidity that I displayed. And if I imparted even a
fraction of that despair on Mr. Liddy and his wife, I truly
apologize for that.

And I understand that, you know, Mr. Liddy has probably received a lot of mail and harassment on that video, and one little apology from me isn't going to go a whole long way. But maybe if they see the things that I did wrong, they won't be so quick to repeat it with other people, and possibly maybe even rethink their views on that video itself. I hope that Mr. Liddy sees my apology as genuine and self-reflective and deeply remorseful.

```
1
                 I'm just very thankful that nobody got hurt. And
 2
      after today, I hope that he and I both can just throw this in
 3
     our wake and never revisit it again. And I truly wish him his
     best life, and I'm going to try to live mine.
 4
 5
                 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Goltz.
                 Okay. There were no--nothing else from the
 6
      defense?
7
                 MR. KING: Nothing further, Your Honor.
 8
 9
                 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Why don't y'all have
10
     a seat.
                 MR. KING:
11
                            Thank you, Your Honor.
12
                 THE COURT: Mr. Haaq?
13
                 MR. HAAG: Yes, Your Honor.
                 Your Honor, we have one victim, the victim in
14
15
      Count 1, Thomas Liddy. He would like to make a statement to
16
      the Court, please.
17
                 THE COURT: All right.
18
            (PAUSE)
19
                 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Liddy.
20
                 MR. LIDDY: Good morning. Thank you, Your Honor.
21
                 THE COURT: Thank you for being here.
22
                 MR. LIDDY: I greatly appreciate the opportunity to
23
     be here. I know a lot of victims across the world don't get
      this opportunity. And even in other states, people don't get
24
25
      this opportunity. But we do here as part of what a wonderful
```

country we live in. And I drove over 700 miles to be here, and as soon as this proceeding is over, I'll be headed back to Phoenix, you know, where my kids are.

I guess I want to start by just thanking you, Your Honor, and thanking this Court, and I want to thank the U.S. Attorneys, Assistant U.S. Attorneys and the marshals and the FBI Special Agents, specifically from the Dallas field office and the Phoenix field office, for doing everything that they have done specifically to protect me and my children.

It was a pretty heavy day at work when the FBI shows up, wants to see my boss and calls me upstairs and says, Mr. Liddy's life is in danger and his children's lives are in danger. "Context" has been mentioned here. Context is everything. Context is everything.

I had four pieces of body armor issued by Maricopa County to my children to protect them during the holidays,
Thanksgiving and Christmas. That's how serious the threat was.
And at the time, they didn't know who made the threat, but they knew that the nature of the threat was out on the dark internet, soliciting the murder of me and my four children.

Of course, the address—the dox—the address that was given was an address of our home for fifteen years that I had sold nine years previously. The first thing I did was ensured that the Chandler Police Department was notified, that the two children that live in that home that you dox'd whose

lives were in danger were protected.

He said what he said. Context is everything. Why me? That's why, Your Honor (indicating). That's why. I'm a deputy county attorney, a chief, Maricopa County Attorney's Office. My job is to give legal advice to every portion of government in Maricopa County, the fourth largest county in the United States; flood control, public health, limited power of government.

It also includes elections. In elections, we have a recorder, and we have a board of supervisors that has a department of elections. I advise them on how to run the elections, and I defend them if they're challenged. Why me? Because I've been involved in elections my entire life. My dad ran for Congress in 1968 in the 20th District of New York State. When I was eighteen years old, the first thing I did was sign up for the draft. The second thing I did was volunteer to work on Ronald Reagan's campaign. And I did that. Very proud to have done that.

I've been involved in elections my entire life. I served as an infantry officer in the second--third battalion of 2nd Marine Division, and I was the battalion elections officer. That's how much I care about elections. I was the deputy counsel for the Republican National Committee from 1995 until 1998, working on, among other things, elections. So when Maricopa County got the opportunity to have me advise them,

they took it. I've been doing that for 15 years.

That's really what this is all about, Your Honor.

The rubber meets the road right here, Lubbock County, Texas, in your courtroom, people challenging our democracy. Ironic that a few days after the Constitution was written, even before it was ratified, Benjamin Franklin said to a patron of Philadelphia, "Congratulations, we've got a democracy if we can keep it." Well, it's been a trying three years, I can tell you that.

Now, when this threat went out against me, there were several things I thought about. "Context is everything," one. "Hey, maybe a big boom; maybe a big explosion, brains all over the sidewalk." Well, been there done that. March of 2021, while I'm writing an appellate brief defending the 2020 election, law enforcement took me out of the building because of a bomb threat right in front of my building. Of course, I was able to finish the brief by moving to an interior office with my colleague and get it done, because I will not be intimidated. Not in '21, not in '22, not in '23, not ever.

But this threat was not a threat just to me. It was a threat to my four children and, necessarily, my wife as well. My four children are dynamic people too. My oldest child is a writer. She writes screenplays. She writes pilots for television. She writes short stories. She's been

published. People are drawn to her. She makes people laugh. She makes people think. And, right now, she's in the legal office of one of the largest corporations in the world defending the rights of other creative people and their music in their legal department.

My second daughter whose life was threatened was serving as a lieutenant in the United States Air Force. And I was that dad running around at all the cross-country meets and the swimming meets with a camera too. I knew the names of all of my children's teammates as well. She did very well in cross-country, extremely well in her academics, and she got

When she came home for Thanksgiving, there were armed guards around our house, and she was issued body armor. Welcome home, Lieutenant. By the way, if you come into the house or out of the house, you have to check in with security. We had armed guards to the north and south of our home 24 hours a day. That's context.

appointed to the United States Air Force Academy. And she was

stationed over 2,000 miles away from her home, looking forward

for an opportunity to see her brothers and her sisters again.

Calling for a Holocaust. Oh, I'm T.L., by the way, Thomas Liddy. I don't care if people know my name. I'm proud of it.

One of my clients, S.R., he has been the

recipient of all kinds of abuse, because he's the recorder in Maricopa County. He has a huge job related to the elections, not the least of which is making sure everyone's registration is up to date, something that happens every single day and, of course, in early voting. He's a Jew, a Jewish American. Had to listen to that filth. He's my client. It affected me.

Another thing mentioned: Oh, one of the other public officials involved in elections—that would be the chairman of the board—he has a wife that's a lawyer.

His wife is a judge. A judge's life was threatened too. So it's not one person whose life was threatened. This particular charge, the one that remains, is a minimum of six.

Mine, my four children, my wife, not to mention the family that lived in the home in Chandler, Arizona, whose lives were threatened as well. That's some serious stuff. It's all about context.

Honor. I've worked in election law many, many years, since 1995. I'm really good at it. Usually I represent Republican candidates, but for the last over a decade, I've represented government, Maricopa County. And so in the 2022 election cycle, there was one race that was very close. That was for Attorney General. The Democrat defeated the Republican by 281 votes. This is—this is a county with almost 3 million votes. Very, very close election.

So, naturally, there was an election challenge, and I'm working every day. I'm--there were several election challenges, and a phone call came in to me from a lawyer whom I know, and he had some questions about this election and questions about the gubernatorial election, which was not as close.

So I called him back on my phone. I made the call to the other individual. And he asked a series of four questions, all of which were very vanilla in election law: how many provisional ballots were there; how many over-votes; how many under-votes; how many ballots were not able to be counted and, therefore, need to be duplicated. This is the sort of thing that, in a normal election contest, is done. There's nothing unusual about it.

But then another person came on the phone and said to me this: "We're going to need these answers very quickly, Mr. Liddy, very quickly. There's a lot of people out there that are angry that want to take to the streets that we can't control, and I'd hate to have to tell them that Thomas Liddy wasn't cooperative."

Well, I knew what that was. That was a threat. I told him I wasn't intimidated by it. He said, oh, I'm not threatening you; I'm just--I'm just worried about your safety.

And I said, I don't give a foxtrot what you're worried about. You've got questions for me? You ask them and

I'll do it.

That was a 12-minute conversation. Two minutes of that was sent out on the internet by somebody else, and they put up words on that that said, "Tom Liddy is not being cooperative," exactly the threat that was made.

The defendant was manipulated, Your Honor. He was manipulated. Ironically, in a sense, he's a victim too, manipulated by a large group of people that are trying to degrade the confidence that people in this country have in their elections.

And I want to say one more thing, Your Honor. I heard today in this courtroom that the defendant has an 11-year-old child. I presume he may be in this courtroom. Well, on January 23rd, 1973, I was a 10-year-old child. My father was sentenced to 20 years in prison. I didn't get a chance to say good-bye to him. He went straight from the U.S. Marshals to prison.

No one in this room knows the damage that can do to a child except me. Tough on my sisters, tough on my brothers too. It's going to be very, very tough on this family. The last thing that I would ask you, Your Honor, is the last thing that you think about before you impose sentence on this defendant is not the defendant, not me, not even the lives of my children, but the real impact that a significant sentence will have on the defendant's children; specifically, his

11-year-old son.

I can look you in the eye, Your Honor, and promise you that any benefit that would come to putting this defendant in prison for 5 years is far, far, far outweighed by the harm it will do to that 11-year-old boy. It's something that we don't pay attention to much. We think about preventing crime by incarcerating people. We think about deterring crimes for incarcerating people. And I believe in all that. But we have to remember the impact it has on the children.

Now, this crime was a crime calling out solicitation for violence. Very real. Impacted me and my children considerably. One of my children, by the way, is a prosecutor, a lawyer.

And I want to thank this Court for changing the date of this proceeding, because my fourth child just graduated high school, is an honor student, and I'm driving him to South Bend, Indiana, to college next week, when this originally was going to be.

I care about my children deeply, deeply. Their lives are precious, as are the lives of the defendant's. But their lives aren't in jeopardy. But the psychic damage that can be done to the young children behind us can be enormous, enormous. And I ask you to bear that in mind when you contemplate going to the upper level or the lower level of the recommended sentence. I personally, Thomas Liddy, T.L., the

```
1
     victim, will not be offended if you take into account these
 2
      children and sentence him to the lower level.
 3
                 Thank you, Your Honor.
                 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Liddy. Mr. Liddy,
 4
 5
     victims often don't come to speak. They have a statutory right
      to speak in federal court. I know that you came a particularly
 6
 7
      long way to share those thoughts with me, so thank you for
      taking the time and traveling those miles to do it.
 8
 9
                 MR. LIDDY: Thank you for the opportunity, Your
10
     Honor.
11
                 THE COURT: Mr. Haag, were there any other victims
12
     that wanted to speak today?
13
                 MR. HAAG: No, Your Honor.
14
                 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
15
                 MR. HAAG: Yes, Your Honor.
16
                 As a procedural matter, I would ask the Court to
17
      dismiss the remaining count and proceed to sentencing on
18
      Count 1.
19
                 THE COURT: That's granted.
20
                 MR. HAAG: Your Honor, I want to address two
21
      3553(a) factors here today.
                 The first factor that I want to discuss is the need
22
     for deterrence. This Court has heard the statement of
23
24
     Mr. Liddy, and I want follow that up with a portion of S.R.--he
25
     is the victim in Count 2. I want to follow up with a portion
```

of his victim impact statement, because I think he so eloquently captures why the need for deterrence is paramount in this case. S.R. writes:

"While I am the person directly threatened in this case, the impact of such threats is felt by a much larger community: the thousands of committed election workers who operate our democratic processes. These election workers are our neighbors, our friends, our family, and our co-workers who, irrespective of their personal beliefs or political affiliations, take time out of their busy schedules to join us for a few days, weeks, or months at a time.

"When threats are made against any election workers, the impact reverberates through the whole community. It creates an atmosphere of fear and apprehension. If those who step forward to serve their community, typically an older demographic, are concerned about intimidation or threats, it could discourage them from participating in future election cycles. This potential chilling effect not only threatens the robust functioning of our electoral processes, but it also strikes at the heart of our democracy.

"In Arizona, we have already seen the impact

of such pressures on our election community. Over the past two years, seven of the fifteen elected county recorders have prematurely left their positions. Beyond leadership posts, we have seen a significantly higher turnover rate for our staff-level positions as well."

As Mr. Liddy and S.R. so eloquently comment, Your Honor, the need to deter people from undermining the election process cannot be overstated.

The second factor that I'd like to discuss, Your Honor, is the need to reflect the seriousness of the offense and to provide a just punishment.

I have struggled in all of my writings to capture just how vile and abhorrent the threats in this case were. When a child is born, the parent takes on that mantle of responsibility for the safety of that child, and that becomes the parent's greatest responsibility. Conversely, failing the child in that becomes a parent's greatest nightmare. It's what keeps parents awake at night. And the fact that the defendant would play upon that fear is inhumane, vile, and repulsive.

I want to thank Mr. Liddy for giving a visceral and powerful statement about the real-life consequences of the threats the defendant made in this case. I cannot, in my wildest dreams, imagine putting body armor on my children.

Your Honor, I ask the Court to impose a sentence in

this case that accounts for the need for deterrence and the need to reflect the seriousness of these truly horrific threats and provide a just punishment for those threats. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Haag, one second. And I'll hear from Mr. King on this too.

I hesitate to award a three-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility in light of the defendant's own statements today. He-- There were a lot of excuses. There were allegations that we didn't look at enough context; we just don't understand; it's just his over-the-top writing; "I always write that way"; "I just took that digitally with me"; "It's just my style"; "This was tongue-in-cheek"; "This was digital tongue-in-cheek." There was an allegation of intellectual dishonesty, and then, ultimately, he just said it was reckless.

He has, under oath, admitted that he knowingly sent or transmitted communications containing a threat to injure the person of another, that he transmitted it with the purpose of issuing a true threat, and that it was sent in interstate or foreign commerce.

I'm having a lot of difficulty squaring that sworn factual statement with what he told me today in his opportunity to address the Court. And he can say whatever he wants. I understand that he has pled guilty and that he saved the government the trouble of a trial. But acceptance of responsibility is a three-level reduction--assuming the

1 government moves for the third, which it has in this case thus 2 far -- in recognition of the societal benefit from someone 3 saying, I was wrong and I truly and fully accept 4 responsibility. 5 And I didn't see any of that today. To the contrary, I saw defiance and excuses. But I don't do that 6 lightly, and I wanted to get your--and I'll allow Mr. King as 7 well. But the defendant's own words here cause me concern to 8 9 not award something that's just not justified. Does the 10 government have a position? 11 MR. HAAG: Yes, Your Honor. 12 The allocution was puzzling, Your Honor. I could 13 not make sense of what he was talking about and why he would--14 why he would try and pass those comments off, which are clearly 15 threats, as anything other than threats. 16 That being said, I don't think he said with 17 sufficient clarity that the statements in Count 1 should not 18

That being said, I don't think he said with sufficient clarity that the statements in Count 1 should not have been taken as threats; they were taken out of context; I didn't mean them like that. I think if he had addressed Count 1 specifically and the statements in Count 1, then I think there would be grounds for removing acceptance of responsibility.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I will give the benefit of the doubt and assume he was talking about the other comments that were made in other series of threads and that those were taken out of context.

```
1
     And if you give him the benefit of the doubt and he wants to
 2
      explain those, I don't think it would require removing
 3
      acceptance of responsibility.
                 THE COURT: Well, acceptance of responsibility
 4
 5
      requires truthfully admitting the conduct, not just of the
 6
      offense of conviction, but also truthfully admitting and not
      falsely denying additional relevant conduct. So that was my
 7
 8
      concern.
 9
                 MR. HAAG: Yes--
10
                 THE COURT: But I understand--I understand your
11
     position.
                 Sorry.
                        Was there something else?
12
                 MR. HAAG: Yes, sir. No, I think, Your Honor, just
13
     because of the more limited scope of relevant conduct under
14
      2A6.1, again, I'll give him the benefit of the doubt that he
15
     was talking about statements outside the ones that would be
16
      included in relevant conduct here, because he did not state
17
      specifically the exact statements he was talking about, other
18
      than about the Holocaust.
19
                 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.
20
                 Mr. King, would you like to be heard on this?
21
                 MR. KING: Your Honor, I believe I will probably
22
     pretty closely echo the government's position.
                 And I incorrectly said something earlier, Your
23
24
             I think I made a statement, and the Court corrected me,
25
      regarding the comment regarding the Holocaust not being, I
```

1 think, specific and an identifiable group. And the Court 2 corrected and said that obviously is. 3 My argument, Your Honor, was within the scope of the distinct group of who was targeted within a threat. I 4 5 think Mr. Goltz, in, partly, response to what I said, was making an attempt to explain that comment. The government is 6 correct regarding those statements that fall within Count 1. 7 He recognizes that those are two threats. There has been not a 8 9 contesting of those issues. Within his allocution to the 10 Court, there wasn't a denial or a contesting of those issues. 11 THE COURT: He said they're digital 12 tongue-in-cheek, just over-the-top writing, how he always 13 writes. 14 MR. KING: Your Honor, that applies -- Mr. Goltz's 15 online persona was bombastic. That's not-- I argue out of 16 both sides of my mouth, and I concede to the Court that I do 17 that, and I'm not trying to convince the Court to rob the 18 acceptance of responsibility. 19 Part of what Mr. Goltz did online was what I 20 referenced the Court, what's referenced in the sentencing 21 memorandum. There is this world online where--22 THE COURT: Yeah, I don't need to hear about that. 23 I understand the world online. I was just focused on his 24 statements today.

MR. KING: I understand. But I think some of what

25

Mr. Goltz is saying is that these are 19 statements that are taken out of where they were placed. It doesn't minimize what is within those statements, but the broader context of the overall vileness—— We've heard from Mr. Liddy regarding other statements that other people have made.

Mr. Goltz did not say this, but I know that he has shared this with me. The address that Mr. Goltz shared had previously been shared. That doesn't minimize Mr. Goltz's actions, but I think what he's saying is the context in where and what I was saying. I was saying things that even he knows is not who he was, and I think that is all part of his explanation and trying to explain to the Court where he was. That doesn't-- because he makes the explanation that it's out of context and that he doesn't--those statements are not who he is does not mean that he does not notice and recognize what those statements that he made are.

THE COURT: Yeah, I wish he would have said that.

But I understand. I understand your point. I understand the government's point. You're very lucky to litigate against someone as candid and as measured as Mr. Haag, because I think most people—most Assistant U.S. Attorneys would hear those statements and say, absolutely, there's not an acceptance.

But that's why I asked the parties. I'm genuinely interested in their view, because maybe I just heard it wrong. But I hear you both telling me that you think he has accepted.

```
1
      I think it's a very, very close call. I don't think he really
 2
     has. I'll think about it some more before I make an ultimate
 3
      decision. But thank you for that, Mr. King.
                 MR. KING: Yes, Your Honor.
 4
 5
                 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Haag, was there
      anything else?
 6
 7
                 MR. HAAG: No, Your Honor.
                                             Thank you.
 8
                 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Mr. Haaq, do you
9
      know any reason why the Court cannot lawfully impose sentence
10
     at this time?
11
                 MR. HAAG:
                           No, Your Honor.
12
                 THE COURT: Mr. King?
13
                 MR. KING: I apologize, Your Honor. No, Your
14
     Honor.
15
                 THE COURT: I have carefully reviewed the
16
     presentence report, its addendum, and its second addendum.
                                                                  Ι
17
      inform the defendant that the plea agreement is finally
                 Judgment and sentence will be consistent with it.
18
     accepted.
19
                 I'm required by statute to impose a sentence that
20
     is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with
21
      the purposes of sentencing set forth in Section 3553(a)(2), and
22
      to consider all the factors in that statute, which I have done.
23
                 All that means is, I consider certain guideposts in
24
     every case to try to figure out what's a reasonable sentence.
25
     One of those is the nature and circumstances of the offense, or
```

what did you do.

We've had extensive discussion about that. We've heard from one victim. We heard a letter from another victim. The comments here are completely outrageous, and they weren't isolated. This isn't a situation where you fall down a rabbit hole; you're having a bad day; you're angry; and instead of kicking the dog, you, you know, are an internet tough guy. This is repeat vile, violent statements that turned to threats, and you back those up.

On one website, there was a long history of threatening statements against many targets, including law enforcement, government officials, Jewish people, and others. Some examples include, "I want to throw that Jew in the oven so badly I can taste it." Another, "We're in dire need of a real Holocaust." Another, on a post related to a federal judge, the defendant commented, "Find out if she has children and where they go to school." Another regarding N.P., the Speaker of the House, you said, "I would love to peel the Speaker's skin off of her body, douse her in gas, and light a match."

But you didn't stop there. On a different website, there were, again, multiple statements. "Hypothetically," you said, "mass shootings"--"a mass shooting of poll workers and election officials in these highly suspect precincts might be the way to go." Another, "Someone should have just walked in and shot them all. They're all trash." Another, "Someone

needs to get to these people and," in all caps, "their children. The children are the most important message to send."

Another, "Let's hope they go for," speaking of the Prime Minister of Canada's, "children first. Then he'll feel this guy's pain." Another, regarding a county official, "It would be a shame if someone got to his children. There are some crazies out there. This kind of info shouldn't be readily available on the internet." But nevertheless, of course, you shared an address.

Regarding another official, "He has got a wife that's a lawyer too. We need to find out her name and where she works. I don't think she has kids, but I'm not 100 percent on that."

Someone tries to say wait, wait, wait, kids--kids are off limits. "No, nothing," all caps, "is off limits. It's people like you that are supposedly with us who don't have the stomach to do whatever it takes. That's why we lose. They have come after our kids every way possible, and you have some aversion to targeting theirs?", question mark. "Thanks for letting me know what foxhole I don't want to be in."

And then finally, "The children are the most important ones to get because it sends a message 100 years into the future that people will pay the price for the sins of the father. Dead children burn the memories"--"burn into the

1 memories of people. Dead adults are forgotten much easier." 2 You can't overstate just the seriousness and the 3 vile nature of those comments and threats. That you said, 4 "Hey, I'm right here, I'm in Lubbock, Texas; I'm not afraid; I 5 mean this," is concerning. That you targeted election officials and public servants just trying to do their job--6 And you can disagree with how they do it, and you can be 7 curious, and you can, you know, be angry about the result. 8 9 targeting these people specifically with threats resulting in 10 the impact that we've heard to real people and their children 11 is inexcusable. It's incredibly serious, and it does damage, 12 not just to those victims, but to our community and our 13 democracy. Again, you can disagree all you want, but nothing, 14 nothing, nothing can excuse the threats, the violence, and the 15 vile comments that you said over and over again. 16 I appreciate the comments from the victim. 17 will be taken into account. The grace that was showed by the 18 victim saying, "Hey, Judge, actually don't go to the top of the 19 statutory range here, because it has effects on the family," 20 that's--I've never seen something like it from a victim, who 21 was trapped in his house, putting body armor on his children,

and now asking me for mercy. You certainly didn't afford that

level of grace to those that you disagreed with, that you

thought were doing something wrong. Your result -- or your

answer to that was calling for violence, again and again and

22

23

24

25

again.

Now, it's not the only thing I consider. What you did here is inexcusable and incredibly concerning. I've also, however, considered your history and your characteristics, and you have no prior convictions, no criminal history, and that certainly mitigates. That weighs heavily in your favor.

I understand your attorney's arguments today. I've taken all that into account. I've taken the sentencing memorandum that—or memoranda that have been filed into account, and their understandable points. One is, essentially, you're a really good father and community member to those that you get along with, and I don't doubt that. It certainly sounds, given the support that's here, that you are an incredibly good family member and community member to those that are around you that you agree with.

You bring an equal level of passion to those you disagree with, and I wish that that kind of polar opposite or photo negative wasn't present, but clearly it is. For those that you love, you will do anything. But it appears that for those that you hate, you'll also do anything, including calling for violence against them and their children.

And so, as often the case, our biggest strengths can be our biggest weaknesses. You obviously feel deeply, but you let that take you down a path of crime and violence, and that can't be excused.

You are lucky to have the support. I understand that people are complicated. I oftentimes see defendants—
This is not—frankly, it's just not unusual that, oh, he's a great soccer coach, baseball coach, took care of Grandma, but he also did X, Y, and Z bad things. People are complicated, and I wish the good person that I heard about from the three people who came and spoke on your behalf would have been the better angel on the shoulder and taken over and said, you can't say these things. You just can't do that.

But that didn't happen. What happened is that you said it not once, not twice, but over and over and over again, and I have to take that into account.

I've heard the arguments about the social media echo chamber. Certainly not a healthy place. Certainly something to avoid. But your comments were particularly bad. That's the reason you're here and a lot of other people that were saying stupid things and outrageous things, but not criminal things—that's why they're not here and you are. You weren't echoing comments like that. You were going above and beyond, and you crossed a very, very thick line into criminality.

It's often the case that a defendant's crime not only affects the victim and the community, but it affects his or her family as well. They're victims too. They didn't do anything to be here. Sadly, that's true in a lot of cases.

And I appreciate the victim's statement about the effect, and I'll take that into account, like I always take it into account. These are real people with real families. But that's almost always true, and I can't ignore the crime that you chose to commit because your conduct will negatively affect your own family. I have to balance a lot of things. Congress tells me that. The people, through Congress, have told me I'm required to balance multiple considerations. I have done that, and I will do that.

I don't think you've accepted responsibility. I really don't. The way you said it, the way you talked to me today, it was just excuses; that's it. Now, I'm not going to remove the points, in light of what the Assistant United States Attorney argued to me and what your lawyer has argued to me. But I don't--I really don't think you have. You haven't grappled with it. It was, "I'm an over-the-top writer, this is tongue-in-cheek," excuse, excuse, excuse. Nothing indicating that you have really and fully and clearly, which is required under the guidelines, accepted responsibility.

But because of the particular nature of this crime and because I do give the benefit of the doubt to both your attorney and the prosecutor and I respect them both deeply, I won't remove the points. I am going to take it into account in fashioning the overall sentence.

The other factors include the requirement that I

impose a sentence that reflects the seriousness of the offense, and this one is incredibly serious. It affects so many people.

I have to promote respect for the law, and this demonstrated a complete disrespect for the law, public servants, and then calling for violence against those people.

I have to give a just punishment, afford adequate deterrence, and protect the public. I do think there are things present that were not adequately taken into account in the advisory guideline range; most particular, the number of the threats, the nature of the threats, and that you consistently called for violence against children.

So I'm denying the defendant's request for a downward-variance sentence of 12 months and one day. I think that would be woefully inadequate. I also think a sentence within the advisory guideline range would be inadequate for all of the reasons that I have stated today.

After considering all of the statutory factors, the purposes of sentencing, and the parties' arguments, I have determined that a sentence of 42 months is sufficient, but not greater than necessary.

I don't think I need to or should go to the top of the statutory range. I think that would be unreasonable. But I'm also not going to go any less than 42 months.

I believe that the guideline calculations announced were correct, but to the extent they were incorrectly

```
1
      calculated, I inform the parties that I would have imposed the
 2
      same sentence without regard to that range, and I would have
 3
      done so for the same reasons, in light of the 3553(a) factors.
     After all, this is a nonquideline variance sentence. So even
 4
 5
      if I were incorrect about the two-threat enhancement, I would
 6
     vary upward to 42 months.
                 Upon release, you're going to be on supervised
 7
      release for a term of 3 years. While on release, you shall
 8
 9
      comply with the mandatory conditions of release listed in your
10
     presentence report and in Section 3583(d).
11
                 Mr. King, did you and your client receive and
12
      discuss my written notice of intent to impose the standard and
13
      special conditions?
14
                 MR. KING: Yes, Your Honor, we did.
15
                 THE COURT: Do you have any objections to them?
16
                 MR. KING: Your Honor, there is no objection. If--
17
     We continue to be of the position that, hopefully through the
      immigration court, Mr. Goltz is not deportable or removed.
18
19
     he is, would the terms of supervised release be placed on hold
20
     while he was removed?
21
                 THE COURT: I don't understand your question.
22
                 MR. KING:
                            I apologize. Frequently, within the
23
      supervised release conditions, there's a condition where, if an
24
      individual is removed from the country, they no longer are
25
      required to abide by the terms of--
```

1 THE COURT: Oh. 2 MR. KING: --the supervised release. And with the 3 statements within the conditions stating that he is to report 4 for immigration after he is released, if he is removed, then 5 the conditions of supervised release would no longer apply? THE COURT: That's my understanding. 6 7 MR. KING: Okay. THE COURT: Yeah, if he were outside of the 8 9 United States's jurisdiction, that's usually what happens. 10 There's no way for a probation officer to adequately or 11 effectively supervise the person. 12 Mr. Haaq? 13 MR. HAAG: Yes, Your Honor, that's correct. Ιf 14 someone is removed from the United States, then the conditions 15 are suspended; there's no need to follow those conditions. 16 THE COURT: Yes. 17 MR. KING: Okay. And just as a clarification and, 18 again, not conceding the removeability issue. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Yes, I understand that. 20 Okay. Hearing no objections, all of those 21 conditions are adopted today. They will be included in my 22 judgment. I find they are reasonable and relate to all of the 23 appropriate statutory considerations, and they impose no 24 greater deprivation of liberty than reasonably necessary under 25 the statute.

1 I find that the defendant does not have the ability 2 to pay a fine. 3 But I'm going--and I will require that he pay the mandatory special assessment of \$100 to the United States, due 4 5 and payable immediately. I'm going to recommend that, while incarcerated, 6 7 the defendant receive appropriate mental health treatment, but I didn't lengthen the term of imprisonment to promote 8 9 rehabilitation. 10 Sir, to the extent you have not waived your right 11 to appeal, you do have the right to appeal your conviction and 12 your sentence. If you'd like to appeal, you need to file a 13 notice of appeal within 14 days of today in this court. If you 14 want to do that, just tell your attorney. He's very familiar 15 with that process, and he can help you get that done. 16 I know that you have retained counsel, but, if 17 appropriate, he can also ask that the costs of the appeal go to 18 the United States, and not to you. 19 Do you understand those appellate rights? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 All right. Mr. King, anything else from the 23 defense? 24 MR. KING: Your Honor, the nonbinding request for 25 FCI Big Spring. I know it was a long time ago that I requested

1 that. 2 THE COURT: That's been granted. 3 MR. KING: And we would--the Fifth Circuit requires a contemporaneous objection. As this was an upward variance, 4 5 we would object to the substantive unreasonableness of the 6 sentence. 7 THE COURT: Okay. I understand. You just think 8 the sentence is just too long? 9 MR. KING: Yes, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Yeah, I understand that objection. 11 all the reasons that I stated earlier, that objection is 12 overruled. 13 I don't impose the sentence lightly, and I do 14 understand the impact it has on family members. I have to 15 balance a lot of factors, and the conduct here is incredibly, 16 incredibly serious. 17 I hope, Mr. Goltz, that you use this time to truly 18 understand how in the world that you got to that podium, to 19 grapple with the statements that you did make and the threats 20 that you made and the impact it had on other people so you can 21 make sure you never get there again. 22 And I really don't think you will. I really don't. 23 But only you can do that. Your attorney can't do it. I can't 24 do it. But there are plenty of people who have never been in 25 trouble who have an aberration, do something bad, go to federal

```
1
     prison. Most of them go on to live perfectly normal, happy
 2
      lives afterwards. This is going to be a dark valley, but it's
 3
     not one you can't get out of if you really think about how you
 4
     got here.
 5
                 Anything else from the United States?
 6
                 MR. HAAG: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
 7
                 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Goltz, at this time, you are
      remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal, and I
 8
 9
     wish you good luck, sir.
10
           (END OF HEARING)
11
12
          I, Mechelle Daniel, Federal Official Court Reporter in and
      for the United States District Court for the Northern District
      of Texas, do hereby certify pursuant to Section 753,
13
      Title 28, United States Code, that the foregoing is a true and
      correct transcript of the stenographically reported proceedings
14
     held in the above-entitled matter and that the transcript page
      format is in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial
15
      Conference of the United States.
16
17
      /s/ Mechelle Daniel
                                   DATE AUGUST 18, 2023
     MECHELLE DANIEL, CSR #3549
18
      FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```